

PAT LUNDVALL (NSBN 3761)
KRISTEN T. GALLAGHER (NSBN 9561)
McDONALD CARANO LLP
2300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 1200
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
Telephone: (702) 873-4100
lundvall@mcdonaldcarano.com
kgallagher@mcdonaldcarano.com

STUART NEWMAN (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
1075 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 2500
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: (404) 885-1500
snewman@seyfarth.com

KAITLYN F. WHITESIDE (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
620 Eighth Avenue
New York, New York 10018
Telephone: (212) 218-5500
kwhiteside@seyfarth.com

Attorneys for Vectrus Systems Corporation

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

VECTRUS SYSTEMS CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

v.

TEAMSTERS LOCAL 631,

Respondent.

Case No. 2:18-cv-01345-JCM-VCF

**ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE
DEFENSES TO COUNTER-PETITION**

Petitioner, VECTRUS SYSTEMS CORPORATION (“Petitioner” or “Vectrus”), and for its answer to TEAMSTERS LOCAL 631’s (“Union”) Counter-Petition, states as follows:

AS TO “COUNTER-PETITION TO CONFIRM THE ARBITRATION AWARD”

1. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “1” of the Counter-Petition.

AS TO “PARTIES”

2. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “2” of the Counter-Petition.

3. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “3” of the Counter-Petition.

AS TO “JURISDICTION”

4. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “4” of the Counter-Petition.

5. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “5” of the Counter-Petition.

AS TO “GENERAL ALLEGATIONS AND CAUSE OF ACTION TO ENFORCE

AWARD”

6. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “6” of the Counter-Petition.

7. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “7” of the Counter-Petition.

8. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “8” of the Counter-Petition. Answering further, Vectrus has never performed services as a subcontractor for PAE.

9. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “9” of the Counter-Petition.

10. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “10” of the Counter-Petition.

11. Petitioner denies the allegations contained in Paragraph “11” of the Counter-Petition. Answering further, on September 26, 2017, URS and its subcontractors Vectrus, Arcata Associates, Inc., and Chugach Federal Solutions, Inc., executed a “Bridge Agreement” with the Union in which the parties agreed to accept all the terms and conditions of the CBA with PAE with respect to their performance of work on the RSSII contract at Creech Air Force Base and the

1 Nevada Test and Training Range only upon their commencing performance of work on the RSSII
2 contract on October 25, 2017.

3 12. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “12” of the Counter-
4 Petition. Answering further, Vectrus’ initial employment offers for persons to perform services
5 at Creech Air Force Base were made and accepted by such persons prior to Vectrus commencing
6 operations on October 25, 2017, and prior to it becoming bound by the Bridge Agreement and
7 CBA.

8 13. Petitioner denies the allegations contained in Paragraph “13” of the Counter-
9 Petition. Answering further, the Union filed a grievance on October 13, 2017 alleging that Vectrus
10 had violated the CBA by not “re-hiring” certain employees on the basis of seniority and the ability
11 to perform available work (notwithstanding the non-disputed fact that they were never Vectrus
12 employees).

13 14. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “14” of the Counter-
14 Petition.

15 15. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “15” that the arbitration
16 hearing was reported by Cameo Kayser, a certified court reporter, and refers the Court to the
17 contents of the referenced document as the best evidence of its contents.

18 16. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “16” of the Counter-
19 Petition. Answering further, Vectrus made a timely and appropriate objection to arbitrability of
20 the dispute, and preserved its right to seek to vacate any award.

21 17. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “17” of the Counter-
22 Petition. Answering further, Vectrus made a timely and appropriate objection to arbitrability of
23 the dispute, and preserved its right to seek to vacate any award.

24 18. Petitioner denies the allegations contained in Paragraph “18” of the Counter-
25 Petition.

26 19. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “19” of the Counter-
27 Petition. Answering further, Vectrus made a timely and appropriate objection to arbitrability of
28 the dispute, and preserved its right to seek to vacate any award.

20. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “20” of the Counter-Petition. Answering further, Vectrus made a timely and appropriate objection to arbitrability of the dispute, and preserved its right to seek to vacate any award.

21. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “21” of the Counter-Petition. Answering further, Vectrus made a timely and appropriate objection to arbitrability of the dispute, and preserved its right to seek to vacate any award.

22. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “22” of the Counter-Petition.

23. Petitioner denies the allegations contained in Paragraph “23” of the Counter-Petition. Answering further, Vectrus made a timely and appropriate objection to arbitrability of the dispute, and preserved its right to seek to vacate any award.

24. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “24” of the Counter-Petition.

25. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “25” of the Counter-Petition.

26. Petitioner admits the allegations in Paragraph “26” of the Counter-Petition that in the Opinion and Award, the Arbitrator discussed the facts of the controversy between the Union and Vectrus and cited and discussed the Bridge Agreement. Answering further, while the Arbitrator purported to cite and discuss various provisions of the CBA, Petitioner denies that the grievance was arbitrable and denies that the Opinion and Award was within the scope of the Arbitrator’s jurisdiction and authority.

27. Petitioner admits the allegations contained in Paragraph “27” of the Counter-Petition.

28. Petitioner admits the allegation in Paragraph “28” that the Arbitrator considered and interpreted the Bridge Agreement. Answering further, Petitioner denies that the Arbitrator considered and interpreted the CBA with respect to an arbitrable dispute.

33. Petitioner denies the allegations contained in Paragraph “33” of the Counter-Petition.

Petitioner asserts the following affirmative and other defenses without assuming any burden of production or proof that it would not otherwise have. Petitioner reserves the right to

1 plead any additional affirmative and other defenses as they become known during the pendency
2 of this action.

3 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

4 The Opinion and Award was not rendered as to an arbitrable dispute.

5 **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

6 The Opinion and Award is not binding or enforceable because the Arbitrator lacked
7 jurisdiction and authority to issue the Opinion and Award.

8 Petitioner reserves the right to amend this Answer should it later discover facts
9 demonstrating the existence of additional affirmative defenses.

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, based upon the foregoing, Vectrus respectfully requests that this Court
12 enter judgment vacating, setting aside, and declaring the Award null and void. Vectrus also
13 requests such other and further relief as may be deemed appropriate by the Court.

14 Dated this 4th day of September, 2018.

15 McDONALD CARANO LLP

16 By: /s/ Pat Lundvall

17 Pat Lundvall (NSBN 3761)
18 Kristen T. Gallagher (NSBN 9561)
2300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 1200
19 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
Telephone: (702) 873-4100
lundvall@mcdonaldcarano.com
kgallagher@mcdonaldcarano.com

20 Stuart Newman (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
21 SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
1075 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 2500
22 Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: (404) 885-1500
snewman@seyfarth.com

23 Kaitlyn F. Whiteside (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
24 SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
620 Eighth Avenue
25 New York, New York 10018
Telephone: (212) 218-5500
kwhiteside@seyfarth.com

26 *Attorneys for Vectrus Systems Corporation*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of McDonald Carano, and that on the 4th day of September, 2018, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO COUNTER-PETITION** was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court by using CM/ECF service which will provide copies to all counsel of record registered to receive CM/ECF notification.

/s/ Beau Nelson

An employee of McDonald Carano LLP